



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/486,723	05/18/2000	MICHAEL LAMLA	JEK/LAMLA	2431

7590 07/13/2009
BACON & THOMAS
625 SLATERS LANE
4TH FLOOR
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314-1176

EXAMINER

PICH, PONNOREAY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2435

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/13/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/486,723	Applicant(s) LAMLA ET AL.	
	Examiner PONNOREAY PICH	Art Unit 2435	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) PONNOREAY PICH. (3) ____.

(2) John Schaefer (Reg. no. 47921). (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 09 July 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Saliba.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Proposed amendments were discussed, which the examiner did not believe overcame Saliba. We also discussed the possibility of further amendments where authentication data are split between two bidirectional channels. This appears to overcome Saliba, but the examiner also noted that he had come across references before where an obviousness rejection would apply.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Ponnoreay Pich/ Examiner, Art Unit 2435	
---	--